



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/764,918	01/18/2001	Jeno Gyuris	GPCI-P02-109	8196

28120 7590 04/02/2002

ROPES & GRAY  
ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE  
BOSTON, MA 02110-2624

EXAMINER
----------

DAVIS, NATALIE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1642

DATE MAILED: 04/02/2002

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/764,918

Applicant(s)

GYURIS ET AL.

Examiner

Natalie A. Davis

Art Unit

1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 and 54-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7, 9-11, 28-33 and 35-62 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 12-27, 34 and 49-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 49, 51, 54-62 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's traversal of the election of Group I, claims 1-27, 34, and 49-53, Species B (tyrosine kinase) is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the inventions are not independent and distinct and may be examined without a serious burden because art relating to Group III should reveal art relating to the other Groups. This is not found persuasive for reasons indicated in the previous office action, as the Groups have different class/subclass, thus rendering them independent and distinct and a serious burden to search. ✓

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL. Claims 1-27, 34, and 49-53, Species B are being examined as belonging to the elected Group I, while claims 7, 9-11, 28-33 and 35-53 are withdrawn from examination as being drawn to a non-elected invention. ?

Applicant's amendment filed 8 January 2002 (Paper No: 7) is acknowledged. Accordingly, claims 1-3 are amended, claim 52 is cancelled, and claims 54-62 are new. Claims 1-27, 34, 49-52 are pending. Claims 54-62 are withdrawn from examination as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

typo  
should  
have been  
53

Applicant indicates that the previous office action does not include claim 48 in any of the Groups and assume that the second occurrence of claim 47 in Group IV should be claim 48. This is correct, as claim 48 should be included in Group IV. Applicants point out that page 3 of the previous office action mistakenly makes reference to Group VI as Group IV. This is correct, as lines 1, 6, 7, and 10 of page 3 should be Group VI instead of Group IV.

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

The information disclosure statement has been considered. A signed copy is attached hereto.

### *Claim Objections*

1. The numbering of the **new** claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution.

When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not). Misnumbered claims 81-89 have been renumbered 54-62.

2. Claims 49 and 51 are objected to because of the following informalities: Albumin is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required. *Specification*

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informality: The specification makes reference to amino acid sequences on pages 4, and 37-39. All nucleotide sequences with ten or more bases and all unbranched, non-D amino acid sequences with four or more amino acids, provided that there are at least 4 "specifically defined" nucleotides or amino acids embedded within the text of the disclosure must be referenced by sequence identifiers (SEQ ID NO:). The rules apply to all sequences in a given application, whether claimed or not. Correction is required. See MPEP § 2422.03.

not  
fixed  
see  
Fig 5

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 50 is indefinite in the recitation of the phrase "Cys 53-Cys 62...". The claim is indefinite because there is no frame of reference in the claim or the specification supplied that will uniquely identify the amino acids of position 53-62 of the cysteine loop.

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1-6, 8, 12-27, 34, and 49-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required, are summarized in *Ex parte* Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986). They include the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in the art, the amount of direction or guidance disclosed in the specification, the presence or absence of working examples, the predictability or unpredictability of the art, the breadth of the claims, and the quantity of experimentation which would be required in order to practice the invention as claimed.

The specification does not indicate what biological activity the heterologous polypeptide must possess. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not know how to make and use the invention because one would not know how to assay and select for the polypeptide since the biological activity of the heterologous peptide has not been defined.

The nature of the invention is to a chimeric polypeptide comprising serum albumin with biologically active heterologous peptide inserted within, wherein the chimeric polypeptide exhibits increased biological activity as compared to the heterologous peptide alone, wherein the sequence shares less than 40% identity with a sequence to which it is compared (p. 9). Claims 2-4 are drawn to a nucleic acids encoding chimeric polypeptides which, comprise fragments of serum albumin or angiogenesis-inhibiting polypeptides. There are many heterologous polypeptide molecules, which have less than 40% identity with a sequence to which it is compared and many fragments of serum albumin or angiogenesis-inhibiting polypeptides that may or may not perform the same biological functions and the specification does not give any guidance to which molecules will exhibit the biological activities as the claimed, or any guidance as to which regions of amino acid sequence are responsible for biological activity and thus, must be preserved so the molecule will function as claimed. Thus, it would be an undue burden to one of ordinary skill in the art to assay for claimed sequences, which are capable of functioning as contemplated. One cannot extrapolate the

drop

teachings of the specification to the breadth of the claims because the claims are broadly drawn to any chimeric polypeptide comprising a biologically active heterologous polypeptide and fragments of serum albumin or angiogenesis-inhibiting polypeptides and applicant has not enabled all of these types of modifications because it has not been shown that these polypeptides are capable of functioning as that which is being disclosed. Reasonable correlation must exist between the breadth of the claims and the enablement set forth, and it cannot be predicted from the disclosure as to which polypeptides and fragments should be isolated.

Protein chemistry is probably one of the most unpredictable areas of biotechnology. For example, conservative replacement of a single "lysine" residue at position 118 of acidic fibroblast growth factor by "glutamic acid" led to the substantial loss of heparin binding, receptor binding and biological activity of the protein (Burgess et al., J of Cell Bio. 111:2129-2138, 1990). In transforming growth factor alpha, replacement of aspartic acid at position 47 with alanine or asparagine did not affect biological activity while replacement with serine or glutamic acid sharply reduced the biological activity of the mitogen (Lazar et al. Molecular and Cellular Biology 8:1247-1252, 1988). These references demonstrate that even a single amino acid substitution or what appears to be an inconsequential chemical modification will often dramatically affect the biological activity and characteristic of a protein. Furthermore, the specification fails to teach what deletions, truncations, substitutions and mutations of the disclosed sequence can be tolerated that will allow the protein to function as claimed. While it is known that many amino acid substitutions are possible in any given protein, the position within the protein's sequence where such amino acid substitutions can be made with reasonable expectation of success are limited. Certain positions in the sequence are critical to the three-dimensional structure/function relationship, and these regions can tolerate only conservative substitutions or no substitutions. Residues that are directly involved in protein functions such as binding will certainly be among the most conserved (Bowie et al. Science, 247:1306-1310, 1990, p. 1306, col.2). Therefore, in view of the unpredictability in the art, lack of working examples, the breadth of the claims, and insufficient guidance as indicated above, one of skill in the art would not be able to practice the claimed invention because undue experimentation would be required.

8. Claims 1-6, 8, 12-27, 34, and 49-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

*Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar* (CA FC) 19 USPQ2d 1111 (6/7/1991) clearly states that "written description" of invention required by first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 is separate and distinct from that paragraph's requirement of enabling disclosure, since description must do more than merely provide explanation of how to "make and use" invention; applicant must also convey, with reasonable clarity to those skilled in art, that applicant, as of filing date sought, was in possession of invention, with invention being, for purposes of "written description" inquiry, whatever is presently claimed. An applicant shows possession by describing the claimed invention with all its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, diagrams, and formulas. Also, description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing the invention was "ready for patenting," or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing.

dmf

The elected claims are drawn to a chimeric polypeptide comprising a heterologous polypeptide and may comprise fragments of serum albumin or angiogenesis-inhibiting polypeptides, such as angiostatin and endostatin. The specification does not disclose any objective evidence regarding the isolation of and assaying of the claimed polypeptide, the successful binding of a heterologous polypeptide to a tyrosine kinase receptor, the induction of apoptosis, modulation of cell proliferation or differentiation of cell types. Likewise, there is no evidence of the chimeric polypeptide exhibiting a half-life of no less than 14 or 10 days in the blood. In addition, no other examples are disclosed that convey to one of skill in the art that the applicant was in possession of a heterologous. There is no actual reduction to practice, sufficient descriptive information, such as definitive structural features, which are critical to polypeptide activity, or complete detailed description of the function of claimed invention indicating that the claimed polypeptide was indeed isolated, produced, and assayed for


the uses disclosed. Thus, one skilled in the art would not recognize from the disclosure that the applicant was in possession of the invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Natalie A. Davis whose telephone number is 703-308-6410. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5:30 (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa PhD can be reached on 703-308-3995. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4315 for regular communications and 703-308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Natalie A. Davis, PhD  
March 25, 2002

  
ANTHONY C. CAPUTA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1100

---